



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

disposal tends to confirm the conclusion that Nabonidus was absent from Babylonia during at least a part of the 7th, 9th, 10th and 11th years of his reign. It seems to the writer not only possible but highly probable that the *"Te-ma-a* visited by Nabonidus was ancient Teimâ in Arabia. That the Neo-Babylonian empire included a large part of Arabia is not unlikely. Nabonidus may have looked after administrative affairs in Arabia, while Belshazzar, as crown prince, directed the government at home. Such a situation would be entirely in harmony with the high position accorded Belshazzar as the second ruler in the kingdom. We can only infer that a close relationship existed between ancient Teimâ and Babylonia. This preliminary note will be followed by a fuller discussion in a future number of the JOURNAL.

RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY

Goucher College

Note on Māgadhi ahake

V. S. Sukthankar, *JAS* 40, p. 253, while discussing Māgadhi *ahake* and noting that Pischel brackets the form as not being actually quotable, overlooks the fact that thirteen years ago I pointed out in *Indogermanische Forschungen* 23. 129 f. that as a matter of fact it occurs a few times in the Devanāgari redaction of the Śakuntalā: see Monier Williams' edition, pp. 218, 219, 221, and Godbole's edition (1891), pp. 183, 184; and note the comment of Rāghavaghaṭṭa: *ahake*: 'ham. 'Aham arthe 'hake hage' ity ukteḥ.

TRUMAN MICHELSON

Bureau of American Ethnology,
Washington, D. C.

A New Creation Story

In a volume of tablets published by H. F. Lutz (*Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts. PBS*, Vol. I, Pt. 2) are found two very important documents which have hitherto escaped the attention of scholars. The first (No. 103), referring to the Fall of Man, will probably appear in *ATSL*. I am here giving a summary of the contents of the second (No. 105); a complete discussion of it will be found in a future issue of this JOURNAL. It is a creation story, notwithstanding the fact that Eridu appears to be regarded

as a city already in existence. It has points of contact with the well-known account of the Marduk-Tiamat fight, which it antedates, since this Sumerian document can be safely placed about 2000.B.C. A summary is as follows:

The god Midimmud speaks to his messenger Zubarra about Eridu, the place loved by the god Enki. There the sea meets with no opposition, the large river spreads terror upon the land, and the abyss is covered by great storm clouds. The messenger is directed to bring to Enki the crafty waters of incantation, and his own mighty monsters, as big as rivers. Weapons are prepared, the combat against the sea follows, and, as a result of this, the safety of Eridu is insured. The god then proceeds to create vegetation, birds and fishes. This done, Enki establishes rain for the ocean, overflow for the abyss, winds for the sea. For the river Euphrates he makes a river bed, so as to control its course.

EDWARD CHIERA

University of Pennsylvania

Once more Shāhbāzgarhi uthanam

I have previously tried to show that *Shāhbāzgarhi uthanam* was a true native word, and that the dental *th* was not merely graphical for lingual *th*: see *JAOS* 30. 85, 86 and *IF* 29. 224–226. The publication of Mārkaṇḍeya's *Prākṛtasarvasva* in the *Grantha Pradarśanī*, and Hultsch's paraphrase of the section dealing with Śaurasenī in *ZDMG* 66. 709–726 makes it possible to support this claim with additional evidence. Observe that Mārkaṇḍeya distinctly prescribes Śaurasenī *utthido* (with dental *tth*) but Māhārāṣṭri *utthio* (with lingual *t̪h*) as correspondents to Sanskrit *utthitas* (for *ud+sthitas*): see III. 15, IX. 40, IX. 137. Hence we may infer a Śaurasenī word *utthānam* (with dental *tth*) which would exactly correspond to *Shāhbāzgarhi uthanam*. That Rājaśekhara does not conform to the rule laid down by Mārkaṇḍeya that in Śaurasenī *sthā* when combined with *ud* becomes *utth-* (with dental *tth*) proves nothing; for years ago both Pischel and Konow proved in detail that he frequently confuses Śaurasenī and Māhārāṣṭri, and Jacobi implied the same thing; more recently (*AJP* 41. 266, 267, 269) I have pointed out a couple more of such blunders. Sir George Grierson in a letter dated November 15th,